1	to file today and then to the extent that
2	there are issues that are keyed up by the
3	request for clarification, they can be replied
4	to, but not any matters that are keyed up by
5	the request for certification.
6	JUDGE STEINBERG: I didn't
7	understand that.
8	MR. BLAKE: Well, that's what I
9	was trying to
10	JUDGE STEINBERG: Let's just leave
11	it the way it is. In the other pleadings,
12	other requests, there is clearly stated that
13	essentially the language and the issues is
14	incorrect, I'm paraphrasing, that the language
15	tracks was 1.1301, whatever the subsection is
16	I read these quickly. I didn't study them.
17	Unless I'm is that sort of
18	right?
19	MR. SOLOMON: I do think, Your
20	Honor, although they're titled differently,
21	but effectively they're saying the same thing
22	and since you have several parties that

1	actually look at whether you have authority on
2	the schedule and you have authority of what
3	you should exercise
4	JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes, but that
5	can be done under the I believe the replies
6	are due on that today, today, and then there's
7	no response. Next time ask for modification
8	of the issue or something more clearly.
9	So we'll leave that one alone with
10	no reply.
11	MR. TOSCANO: Your Honor, I'd also
12	like to clarify as to Mr. Blake's October 22nd
13	letter that you're not treating that as a
14	motion and that we don't need to reply to
15	that?
16	JUDGE STEINBERG: No, that was a
17	letter to Judge Sippel which he came in and
18	handed to me and I read it and I presume
19	that's
20	we're going to talk about some of that
21	stuff this morning. It was just sort of a
22	suggestion as to some of the things we could

1	talk about today which I might adopt or might
2	not.
3	MR. TOSCANO: Thank you.
4	JUDGE STEINBERG: So but it's not
5	a formal pleading that needs a response.
6	Whatever we need to talk about, we can talk
7	about this morning.
8	Let me request something from the
9	Enforcement Bureau. If you could I would
10	appreciate it if you could comment on the
11	portion comment on anything you want to
12	comment on. I'm not restricting you in any
13	way, shape, or form. But if you would comment
14	on those portions of the motions for
15	modification that concern the framing, the
16	language of the issues, what your belief is
17	with respect to whether the language should be
18	changed as suggested in the motions or whether
19	the language is sufficient as it is.
20	If you could do that, I'd
21	appreciate it.
	1

MR. SCHONMAN: In writing or not?

1	JUDGE STEINBERG: In writing.
2	MR. SOLOMON: Thank you.
3	JUDGE STEINBERG: I prefer to get
4	things in writing, so I can look at them and
5	think about them.
6	Okay, any other pleadings that I
7	have that I'm supposed to have that I don't
8	know about?
9	Mr. Blake, anything you know of?
10	MR. BLAKE: No, sir.
11	JUDGE STEINBERG: Ms. Wallman?
12	MS. WALLMAN: Nothing else, Your
13	Honor.
14	JUDGE STEINBERG: Mr. Dunbar?
15	MR. DUNBAR: No, Your Honor.
16	JUDGE STEINBERG: Mr. Mills, Mr.
17	Redding?
18	MR. MILLS: The only question is
19	when the Enforcement Bureau might provide
20	those comments?
21	JUDGE STEINBERG: The 30th.
22	MR. MILLS: The 30th, great. Then

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	nothing further.
2	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Mr.
3	Cohen, Mr. Harding?
4	MR. HARDING: No, Your Honor.
5	JUDGE STEINBERG: Mr. Beckner?
6	MR. BECKNER: No, sir.
7	JUDGE STEINBERG: And Mr. Solomon?
8	MR. SOLOMON: No, Your Honor.
9	JUDGE STEINBERG: Did I leave
10	anybody out?
11	Mr. Schonman?
12	MR. SCHONMAN: You did not, but
13	you answered my question about when our motion
14	would be due. Thank you.
15	JUDGE STEINBERG: I have a few
16	things with respect to housekeeping.
17	When you file something, could you
18	please email me or fax me a copy of whatever
19	you file. And I don't mind waiting a day or
20	so to get a copy that shows the Secretary's
21	stamp or the electronic receipt.
22	We've been having a heck of a

problem with getting mail and sometimes the only way I know whether anything has been filed is if I get from you. So if -- yes, sir?

MR. HARDING: Your Honor, your order requests everything faxed.

JUDGE STEINBERG: That's Judge Sippel's order. Any way which is convenient for you. A .pdf copy, just take a picture of the front page and the rest of it, that's fine. Judge Sippel throws that into every designation order, not every -- every assignment order and -- but email is fine. I can always just click print and -- you know, at the expense of several trees, but okay.

When you serve something on your opponent, I would prefer that you serve -- I can't direct it that you do it this way, but I would prefer that you send it by email to them also and if you want to mail a hard copy, that's fine. But email is the same thing as hand service and it would substantially

1	expedite things, plus it saves somebody the
2	trouble of figuring out the due date when you
3	don't have to look at 1.4 for all the rules on
4	mailing. That was a joke too.
5	MR. BLAKE: But true.
6	JUDGE STEINBERG: I'm going to
7	have to work on this group.
8	(Laughter.)
9	MR. SOLOMON: I had to write those
10	rules. So when you said it was a joke
11	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay, the other
12	question I have for you is we've got six, in
13	essence, separate cases consolidated for
14	hearing. I don't see that it makes any sense
15	for let's say somebody files a motion to do
16	something to serve everybody in the world with
17	that motion. I think we can get away with
18	just serving your opponent in that particular
19	case.
20	Does anybody have any thoughts on
21	that?
22	Certainly, if you want to serve

1	everybody in the world I can't that's fine
2	with me, but I don't think it makes any sense
3	to do so, because if you serve somebody that's
4	in another case, they don't have the right to
5	respond anyway. So what difference would it
6	make, unless everybody just wants to be kept
7	apprised of what's going on in every other
8	case, but I would suspect you've got enough to
9	do without doing that.
10	MR. SCHONMAN: Your Honor, if I
11	might speak.
12	JUDGE STEINBERG: sure.
13	MR. SCHONMAN: The Bureau would
14	want to be served with every pleading filed in
15	all the cases.
16	JUDGE STEINBERG: With the
17	exception of, I'm sure, the Bureau.
18	I thought that was kind of
19	understood though, since you're a party to all
20	cases.
21	Anybody want to comment? Does
22	anybody have any objection to doing it that

1	way?
2	Okay, hearing no objection, then
3	just serve your counterpart in that particular
4	proceeding and the Bureau.
5	But if you want to serve
6	everybody, that's fine too. It's up to you.
7	Yes?
8	MS. WALLMAN: Perhaps related to
9	that service issue, I'm just thinking on
10	Thursday we have three responses due to
11	functionally identical requests and so forth.
12	Would there be any objection to my properly
13	captioning that, but putting it
14	JUDGE STEINBERG: It's a
15	consolidated response?
16	MS. WALLMAN: Right.
17	JUDGE STEINBERG: No, just serve
18	it on the four parties?
19	MS. WALLMAN: Three.
20	JUDGE STEINBERG: Just joint
21	response to A, B, and C, and put the right
22	caption on it with the three cases, and just

1	serve the people in those cases and the
2	Bureau.
3	Do you want three copies of that,
4	Mr. Schonman or just one?
5	That's a joke, too.
6	(Laughter.)
7	MR. SCHONMAN: You had me going.
8	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay, I knew I
9	did.
10	MS. WALLMAN: Thank you, Judge.
11	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay, that
12	concludes what I'm prepared to do today. Does
13	anybody have anything that they want to bring
14	up? If not I'm sure there are going to be
15	things.
16	MR. SOLOMON: Your Honor, I do
17	just have a couple of questions to understand
18	your orders, make sure we understand it
19	correctly.
20	Are you contemplating oral direct,
21	rather than written direct?
22	JUDGE STEINBERG: I don't have any

1	if you prepare your direct cases, you can
2	prepare it any which way you want. I think it
3	would be a gigantic I mean, we have
4	essentially 6 cases, 12 parties. I'm
5	allowing, according to my schedule it will be
6	eight, eight-hour days for the hearing, from
7	8 to 12 and approximately 1 to 5.
8	That leaves everybody with five
9	hours to present each case which you know, is
10	in my opinion, ludicrous. That's what we're
11	dealing with at the current moment.
12	I should tell you on the motions
13	for certification and modification, I'm going
14	to wait to get the responses and I'm going to
15	write something. It might be a single
16	pleading, a single order. It might be
17	separate orders. It might be a single order.
18	That's what I'm thinking now, as expeditiously
19	as possible.
20	But let me see, what were the dates I sent?
21	MR. BLAKE: November 10th.
22	JUDGE STEINBERG: For direct?

1 MR. BLAKE: Yes. 2 JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes. Well, try 3 to get something out before then. I mean, if 4 the last response, what, we consolidated into 5 the 30th? 6 MS. WALLMAN: The opposition --7 JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes, and so none of them are due after the 30th? 8 Pardon me? 9 Okay, then this reply is to the 10 30th. The first is Saturday, right? So the replies would be due close to November 10th. 11 12 So I don't, well, I don't want to be unfair to 13 guys, and I'm prepared to, Ι you 14 basically, I don't want you spinning your 15 wheels for no purpose and spending 16 client's money for no purpose. 17 So I think what I might do, what I think, not what I might do, what I'm going to 18 19 do is suspend the procedural dates until after 20 my order comes out, ruling on them requests 21 for certification and then have another pre-

hearing conference at that time and see where

we stand and what could be worked out.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Given those circumstances, I have to be candid, it is not possible to do this within the 60 days. So we might want to shoot for a certain period of time after that ruling is made. That ruling is going to be basic to the case and it will affect all aspects, all remaining aspects of the case. And I think it's more important to do things correctly than to do things quickly.

Yes.

MR. BLAKE: Your Honor, do you think it will be useful to have argument after the replies come in?

JUDGE STEINBERG: Oral argument? I've done a number of I hate oral argument. them, you know, not myself where I presented. It's just a total waste of time. Judges are They know what they're going to up there. Their sole purpose in life is to rule. embarrass the hell out of you and make you 1ook like fool and make them

1	tremendously smart, and if that is what you
2	want to do, I'm willing to look tremendously
3	smart, but
4	(Laughter.)
5	But I don't think I want to do
6	that.
7	MR. BLAKE: Your Honor, could we
8	talk a little bit more about suspending the
9	hearing dates?
10	The NFL network has a huge
11	interest in trying to get this resolved, which
12	will have to be by negotiation, but the course
13	of this hearing will help that so that the
14	games that are coming up, beginning on
15	November 6th
16	JUDGE STEINBERG: There is no way
17	anything is going to be
18	MR. BLAKE: I understand that.
19	JUDGE STEINBERG: done by
20	November 6th.
21	MR. BLAKE: But if we can keep
22	moving forward, then the interest in having

this programming available to the public can 1 2 be served and certainly our client is willing 3 to go forward and take the risk of time and money involved because of the need to move 4 forward as quickly as possible with getting 5 the proceeding moving forward as a framework 6 for trying to resolve the disputes. 7 Ι thoroughly JUDGE STEINBERG: 8 9 understand your position. Even assuming that 10 my recommended decision came out in 60 days, 11 December something. Then the that's Commission has got to take a look at it and 12 depending on the results of the election, 13 14 frankly, the Commissioners might be interested in something else, namely their next jobs and 15 16 things like that. (Laughter.) 17 And they're not going to get to 18 19 this thing in a week or two. MR. BLAKE: I understand, but just 2.0 the course of the hearing would be helpful in 21

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

terms of trying to resolve the disputes so

that the games can be carried. It's clear 1 2 from the pleadings that have been filed thus far that the cable industry would like to 3 4 delay this, and the programmers would like to move it forward. And our concern is that 5 6 suspending the hearing date comes down on one 7 side of that concern, that debate. 8 JUDGE STEINBERG: So everybody 9 spends a ton of money preparing exhibits that 10 will never, ever be used at that time. 11 MS. WALLMAN: Your Honor, Wealth 12 TV. We appreciate that risk. The delay is a 13 big problem for a small business. In the spirit of trying to keep things moving, we 14 15 would be willing to file our opposition to the request today, rather than Thursday. 16 17 would save a few days on the --JUDGE STEINBERG: You're free to 18 But 19 file it at any time you want. if everybody does, you might be the only one 20 21 filing today and somebody might file Thursday,

I still will have to wait.

But as soon as it is ready to be 1 2 ruled on, it will be ruled on. I'm not going to sit on it for months. 3 4 MR. BLAKE: Well, we completely 5 understand your willingness to try to keep it moving, but our concern is that this really 6 does come down on one side of a very important 7 The record is replete with instances 8 issue. where this is tried to be spun out by the 9 independent 10 cable industry, to thwart programmers, and this would be another success 11 in their being able to do so. 12 13 JUDGE STEINBERG: I really don't see that I have any other choice to be fair to 14 15 everybody in the room. I can't be fair to you and unfair to them, or fair to them and unfair 16 I have to be unfair to everybody. 17 to you. It is a perfectly 18 MR. BLAKE: level playing field for both sides of this 19 2.0 issue to have to go forward with the hearing while these issues are being deliberated on. 21

That's even-handed.

Your Honor, this MR. FREDERICK: 1 2 is David Frederick for TCR. The NFL and TCR MASN are going to file if Wealth TV files 3 today. All of the oppositions to the motions 4 for certification are going to be filed today, 5 and that will speed up the process by several 6 7 days. JUDGE STEINBERG: That's fine. 8 9 because the reply date runs from the date that 10 the opposition -- that's great. So I can get to it sooner and then we'll see where we stand 11 12 after I rule. Would it be possible 13 MR. BLAKE: to hold off on the decision about what to do 14 15 the procedural dates until you've had a chance to look at the pleadings? In other words, 16 17 keep the dates that you ordered here and then move forward on that basis? 18 MR. TOSCANO: Your Honor, this is 19 20 not, this is supposed to be a fair, fact-21 finding proceeding, not a proceeding by which

the NFL can get some leverage in negotiation.

1	It's Comcast that elected ADR. The NFL chose
2	not to elect ADR. I don't think in making a
3	decision you should take into account how this
4	is going to affect the NFL's negotiating
5	leverage.
6	JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, NFL did
7	not reject ADR, they just rejected the
8	suspension, the 60-day limit. So, yes, the
9	60-day thing. They said that they didn't like
10	that condition, although the condition was in
11	the HDO, not something he made up.
12	I'm going to stick with my ruling
13	and I'm just going to suspend the dates. I
14	will issue an order to that effect. I will
15	rule as expeditiously as possible and then we
16	will have another conference and see where we
17	go.
18	Anything else? Yes, sir.
19	MR. HARDING: Your Honor, as I
20	read 1.45, replies are due five days from the
21	date

JUDGE STEINBERG: Oh, 1.45 doesn't

1	apply. It's 1.294. We're in hearing.
2	MR. HARDING: Thank you, sir.
3	JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes, 1.45 is
4	just a general pleading rule on 1.294 at the
5	one specific to hearings.
6	MR. SOLOMON: Can I ask you
7	question, Your Honor?
8	JUDGE STEINBERG: Sure.
9	MR. SOLOMON: If it's 1.294 and
10	it's four days, wasn't it due on Friday, the
11	opposition to our motions, that is today is
12	four days from Monday?
13	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay, start
14	again.
15	MR. SOLOMON: We filed on Monday
16	and served on Monday. If it is four days from
17	Monday, then that's Tuesday, Wednesday,
18	Thursday, Friday, then the time for filing
19	oppositions to our motion has expired.
20	JUDGE STEINBERG: What dates
21	expired?
22	MR. SOLOMON: Friday was the 24th.

1	We filed on the 20th, so the 21st
2	JUDGE STEINBERG: Well,
3	technically you filed on the 21st.
4	MR. SOLOMON: But we have a
5	receipt from the 20th.
6	JUDGE STEINBERG: The receipt says
7	Bureau Office.
8	MR. SOLOMON: No, we have a
9	receipt from the Secretary's Office from the
10	20th.
11	JUDGE STEINBERG: So Office of the
12	Secretary?
13	MR. SOLOMON: We filed it with the
14	Secretary.
15	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay, send it to
16	me.
17	MR. SOLOMON: Okay.
18	JUDGE STEINBERG: If that's true,
19	then I will extend the deadline until today.
20	MR. BLAKE: As I understand it was
21	filed with the Secretary on Tuesday, so we
22	push forward four days?

1	MR. SOLOMON: No, I believe it was
2	filed on Monday. I will double-check, and if
3	it was filed on Monday correctly, I will
4	JUDGE STEINBERG: Given the
5	confusion, I mean, you all intend to file
6	today? Given the confusion, I will extend the
7	time for today. It's important
8	MR. SOLOMON: So we still don't
9	get a reply?
10	JUDGE STEINBERG: No. I'm not
11	saying you can't cooperate with somebody else
12	in the fashion of replying. That's your
13	business.
14	MR. LEVY: Your Honor, can I ask a
15	question in anticipation of the hearing?
16	JUDGE STEINBERG: Sure.
17	MR. LEVY: It's Gregg Levy for the
18	NFL Network. Can we assume that the
19	declarations and affidavits and exhibits that
20	have already been filed as part of the
21	complaint process will be before Your Honor
22	and part of the record for purposes of the

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

hearing?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

JUDGE STEINBERG: No. It's a de novo hearing, and you have to, well, it's a de novo hearing. Let me leave it at that. And if you want the declaration of X to come in, X has to be available for cross examination if they want them.

MR. LEVY: That was my assumption.

But may we submit such a declaration and present the witness for cross examination?

JUDGE STEINBERG: Sure. Of Yes, just basically the hearing record is a box and when we start the hearing the box is empty. And we all proceed to fill up the box and then we close the record and whatever is in the box is what I base my decision on. And nothing is in the box right Not the complaints. The HDO in the box now. is only for the purpose of showing that there was an HDO issued. And that this was the --MR. TOLLIN: Just for

Are you talking about

clarification.

1	complaint itself or the exhibits, the
2	declarations
3	JUDGE STEINBERG: The complaints -
4	- if somebody wants to introduce the
5	complaints and take official notice of the
6	complaints.
7	MR. TOLLIN: Okay.
8	JUDGE STEINBERG: Something that's
9	of that nature, I can take official notice of,
10	but it's still got to be presented.
11	MR. LEVY: My concern was that in
12	light of the limited time period for the
13	hearing, if we could expedite the process by
14	submitting either through the declarations
15	that are already, have already been filed with
16	the Commission or through some similar written
17	affirmative testimony to satisfy our burden of
18	proof.
19	JUDGE STEINBERG: That's fine.
20	MR. LEVY: Understood.
21	JUDGE STEINBERG: And that's
22	anyway you want to do it. I can't direct you

1	as to how to present your case. Although it
2	would be extremely helpful to have it all in
3	writing.
4	MR. LEVY: Understood.
5	JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.
6	MR. BLAKE: Your Honor, with
7	respect to that point you just made and the
8	concern you expressed earlier about the time
9	allotted, would it be appropriate to require
10	that the affirmative cases be put in writing?
11	JUDGE STEINBERG: I could do that
12	if this was a comparative broadcast hearing,
13	but I can't do if it's any other kind of
14	hearing.
15	MR. BECKNER: Your Honor, if I
16	might?
17	JUDGE STEINBERG: Sure.
18	MR. BECKNER: I think there's a
19	problem with the process you're talking about,
20	because if a party is going to present 30
21	pages of prefiled direct and on day one of the
22	hearing hand the witness 30 pages of prefiled

direct, and then say to opposing counsel, your 1 2 witness to cross examination, that counsel 3 hasn't seen that document. JUDGE STEINBERG: Sure, you have. 4 in the exhibit 5 That will be exchanged 6 exchange. 7 MR. BECKNER: Okav. MR. TOLLIN: Actually, the problem 8 is if the party doesn't put in written direct, 9 you're not going to have any idea of what the 10 oral testimony is going to be all about. 11 12 JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, let me put 13 it this way. If the situation like that 14 occurs, in the past what I have done was I recessed the hearing and allowed counsel 15 that's doing the cross examination sufficient 16 οf time to develop the 17 period cross 18 examination -- that's only fair. That's why we need depositions. 19 MR. BLAKE: Your Honor, what if we 20 agree right now, among all the 21 to tried parties, that they'll put their direct in